arXiv:1511.00528v1 [math.CA] 2 Nov 2015

A NEW APPROACH TO NON-HOMOGENEOUS LOCAL Tb THEOREMS: SQUARE FUNCTIONS AND WEAK $(1,1)$ TESTING WITH MEASURES

HENRI MARTIKAINEN, MIHALIS MOURGOGLOU, AND EMIL VUORINEN

ABSTRACT. We develop a new method to prove local Tb theorems via the non-homogeneous good lambda method and boundedness in big pieces. We also significantly improve known results. Here we work in the setting of vertical square functions V in $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with a non-homogeneous Borel measure μ. We only need that for every *doubling* cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with *small boundary* there exists a non-degenerate complex measure ν_Q supported on Q so that a weak $(1,\epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$, testing holds, and some quantitative absolute continuity holds in a big piece. For example, $(L^{1+\epsilon_1}, L^{\epsilon_2,\infty})$ testing with any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ suffices.

1. INTRODUCTION

We provide a new strategy to prove local Tb theorems. We also significantly improve known results. In this paper we work in the context of square functions. Our strategy (not restricted to the square function setting) is to prove that given a cube Q and an appropriate test function b_Q (or more generally an appropriate complex measure ν_Q) on the cube we can conclude that our square function operator V is L^2 bounded on a big piece (in μ-measure) $G_Q \subset Q$. If this happens in every doubling cube Q with small boundary, a modification of the good lambda theorem by Tolsa, Theorem 2.22 in [19], implies that V is bounded in $L^2(\mu)$. We are therefore reduced to working inside a fixed cube Q and proving the aforementioned boundedness in some big piece G_Q. Essentially, the way we do this is to perform a change of measure to $\sigma := |b_Q|\, d\mu$ and apply a deep version of the global Tb theorem (the big pieces one by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg) with the measure σ and the L^∞-function $b_Q/|b_Q|$. In essence, we make the measure worse but the function a lot better. In order to pass from the μ measure to the σ measure, and then back, we require appropriate stopping times.

We will now describe our setting in detail and formulate the main theorem. After that, we shall discuss the context and the history. We work in the Euclidean

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B20.

Key words and phrases. non-homogeneous analysis, Local Tb theorems, square functions.

H.M. is supported by the Academy of Finland through the grant Multiparameter dyadic harmonic analysis and probabilistic methods, and is a member of the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Analysis and Dynamics Research.

Research of M.M. is supported by the ERC grant 320501 of the European Research Council (FP7/2007-2013).

E.V. is a member of the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Analysis and Dynamics Research.

space $\mathbb{R}^n$. We always assume that for some fixed exponents $m, \alpha > 0$, the kernels $s_t \colon \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $t > 0$, satisfy the size condition

$$|s_t(x,y)| \lesssim \frac{t^\alpha}{(t+|x-y|)^{m+\alpha}}, \tag{1.1}$$

the y-Hölder condition

$$|s_t(x,y) - s_t(x,z)| \lesssim \frac{|y-z|^\alpha}{(t+|x-y|)^{m+\alpha}} \tag{1.2}$$

whenever $|y-z| < t/2$, and the x-Hölder condition

$$|s_t(x,y) - s_t(z,y)| \lesssim \frac{|x-z|^\alpha}{(t+|x-y|)^{m+\alpha}} \tag{1.3}$$

whenever $|x-z| < t/2$.

Let $M(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the vector-space of all complex Borel measures in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The variation measure of $\nu \in M(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is denoted $|\nu|$ and the total variation is $\|\nu\| = |\nu|(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For a given complex measure ν we define

$$\theta_t \nu(x) = \int s_t(x,y)\, d\nu(y), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Our object of study, the vertical square function V, is defined by

$$V\nu(x) = \Big(\int_0^\infty |\theta_t \nu(x)|^2 \, \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/2}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Given a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ define also the truncated version

$$V_Q \nu(x) = \Big(\int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\theta_t \nu(x)|^2 \, \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/2},$$

where $\ell(Q)$ denotes the side length of Q.

We say that a (positive) Radon measure μ is of order m, if $\mu(B(x,r)) \lesssim r^m$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$. For $f \in \bigcup_{p\in[1,\infty]} L^p(\mu)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we set

$$\theta_t^\mu f(x) := \theta_t(f\, d\mu) = \int s_t(x,y) f(y)\, d\mu(y)$$

and

$$V_\mu f(x) := V(f\, d\mu)(x) = \Big(\int_0^\infty |\theta_t^\mu f(x)|^2 \, \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/2}.$$

Define also $V_{\mu,Q} f = V_Q(f\, d\mu)$. The above definitions make sense also when μ is finite.

To state the main theorem we still need the concept of doubling cubes and cubes with small boundary. A cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called (α,β)-doubling for a given measure μ if $\mu(\alpha Q) \le \beta \mu(Q)$. Given $t > 0$ we say that a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has t-small boundary with respect to the measure μ if

$$\mu(\{x \in 2Q \colon \ \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial Q) \le \lambda \ell(Q)\}) \le t\lambda \mu(2Q)$$

for every $\lambda > 0$.

The following is our main result.

1.4. **Theorem.** *Let μ be a measure of order m in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $B_1, B_2 < \infty$, $\epsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ be given constants. Let $\beta > 0$ and C_1 be large enough (depending only on n). Suppose that for every $(2,\beta)$-doubling cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with C_1-small boundary there exists a complex measure ν_Q so that*

(1) spt $\nu_Q \subset Q$;
(2) $\mu(Q) = \nu_Q(Q)$;
(3) $\|\nu_Q\| \leq B_1\mu(Q)$;
(4) For all Borel sets $A \subset Q$ satisfying $\mu(A) \leq \epsilon_0\mu(Q)$ we have

$$|\nu_Q|(A) \leq \frac{\|\nu_Q\|}{32B_1}.$$

Suppose there exist $s > 0$ and for all Q as above a Borel set $U_Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\nu_Q|(U_Q) \leq \frac{\|\nu_Q\|}{16B_1}$ and

$$\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^s \mu(\{x \in Q \setminus U_Q \colon V_Q\nu_Q(x) > \lambda\}) \leq B_2\|\nu_Q\|.$$

Then $V_\mu \colon L^p(\mu) \to L^p(\mu)$ for every $p \in (1,\infty)$.

If $V_\mu \colon L^2(\mu) \to L^2(\mu)$ boundedly, then $V \colon M(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^{1,\infty}(\mu)$ boundedly. In this case, given ν_Q like above one has to have

$$\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda\mu(\{x \in Q \colon V_Q\nu_Q(x) > \lambda\}) \leq \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda\mu(\{x \colon V\nu_Q(x) > \lambda\}) \leq C\|\nu_Q\|.$$

This makes the assumptions necessary.

The previously known local Tb theorems for square functions are easily seen to be included in this theorem. For example, a local Tb theorem with $(L^q, L^{s,\infty})$, $q > 1$, $s > 0$, testing follows from the above theorem (and this is already more general than anything previously known). To see this, just set $\nu_Q = b_Q\, d\mu$ for some b_Q supported in Q satisfying that $\mu(Q) = \int_Q b_Q\, d\mu$ and $\int_Q |b_Q|^q\, d\mu \lesssim \mu(Q)$. The assumption $q > 1$ is only used to conclude (4) using Hölder's inequality. But one can have $q = 1$ if one has (4) by some other virtue. We also allow to work with measures, allow a small exceptional set U_Q, and require the existence of ν_Q only in very regular cubes Q.

In the previously known best results one needed an L^q norm also on the operator side (if $b_Q \in L^q$, $q > 1$, like in the above discussion). Indeed, Hofmann [7] proved the L^2 boundedness of the square function under local L^q testing conditions in the case that μ is the Lebesgue measure. In [13] the two first named authors extended this result to non-homogeneous measures with a completely different type of proof than the one we use in this paper. There it was necessary to work intrinsically in L^q, while in this paper no such delicate L^q estimates are needed. In turn, [13] was an extension of [11], where Lacey and the first named author studied non-homogeneous square functions using L^2 test functions (this was the first such result in the non-homogeneous regime).

An important point is that we require these testing conditions only in *doubling* cubes Q with small boundary. We are not aware how to modify the strategies in [10], [11] and [13] to yield this generality. We think that verifying these estimates is much easier now, especially due to the doubling assumption.

Let us now talk about the context and the history previous to the above developments. One can consider Tb theorems at least for square functions and Calderón–Zygmund operators. These theorems can be global or local. In the local case, they can be with the easier L^∞/BMO/tent space type testing assumptions, or with the more general L^q, $q < \infty$, type assumptions. In the latter case the range of the exponents (in the Calderón–Zygmund world more than one set of testing functions appear) one can use is a significant problem. Lastly, non-homogeneous theory is considerably more difficult than the doubling theory, especially in conjunction with rough test functions.

The point of local Tb theorems (the first is by M. Christ [5]) compared to (global) Tb theorems is as follows. The accretivity of a test function b_Q is only assumed on its supporting cube Q, i.e., $|\int_Q b_Q \, d\mu| \gtrsim \mu(Q)$. The other assumptions are originally scale invariant: $b_Q \in L^\infty(\mu)$ and $Tb_Q \in L^\infty(\mu)$. The aim has been to allow these more general L^q testing conditions. The first such result for model operators in the Lebesgue case is [1].

The story in the Calderón–Zygmund case is rather complicated. The state of the art in the Lebesgue situation is the Hytönen–Nazarov paper [9]. It allows L^p testing conditions, but some of the cases require a buffer assumption (the necessity of which is unclear). Previous results related to using general exponents include Hofmann's result [8], Auscher–Yang [4] and Auscher–Routin [3]. The latest in the non-homogeneous case is by Lacey and the first named author [10]. It is a non-homogeneous local Tb theorem with L^2 test functions. It is an open problem to cover general exponents like in [9] also with general measures.

The history in the square function setting goes as follows. The (Lebesgue) case $q = 2$ is implicit in the Kato square root papers, e.g. [2], and explicitly stated and proved e.g. in [6]. The case $q > 2$ is weaker than this. The hardest case $q \in (1, 2)$ is due to Hofmann [7] in the Lebesgue case and by the current authors in the non-homogeneous setting [13] as already mentioned (but as highlighted these results require L^q testing also on the operator side). Previously, one of the key difficulties in proving non-homogeneous results was that it was difficult to prove the boundedness of certain b_Q-adapted (or twisted) martingale transforms (see [10]). We do not need any such transformations in our new strategy.

We still mention that the study of the boundedness of non-homogeneous square functions was initiated by the first two named authors in [12]. This was a global Tb. The key technique was the usage of good (in a probabilistic sense) Whitney regions. A scale invariant local Tb is by the first two named authors together with T. Orponen [14]. In that paper the end point theory, L^p theory, and various counter-examples (e.g. the failure of the change of aperture with general

measures and the difference between conical and vertical square functions) are studied.

In Section 2 we prove our main result. In Section 3 we prove a "big pieces" global Tb theorem for square functions, which we need to apply in Section 2. The first version of such a result for antisymmetric Calderón–Zygmund operators appear in the work by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg [18] in connection with the Vitushkin conjecture. The result can also be found in the book by Tolsa [19] (Theorem 5.1). Here we take care of the square function case with an efficient use of our good Whitney technique.

Finally, we compare our method to that of Hytönen–Nazarov [9]. They do not use this "big pieces" global Tb (which involves suppression arguments) or the localisation provided by the good lambda method. Rather, they use the general idea of suppression. First, a rough test function is written as a sum of the good and bad part using the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition. The good part is a non-degenerate L^∞ function which they want to use as a test function in some "baby" Tb theorem (essentially a local Tb theorem with (L^∞, L^p) testing conditions). To transfer the testing conditions to this bounded function they have to perform stopping times in a delicate order, and suppress their operator appropriately in the bad set. The proof of the baby Tb theorem also requires to work intrinsically in L^p for $p \neq 2$. As such their proof is very different from our strategy outlined in the beginning of the introduction. Moreover, it does not appear to be clear how to extend their method to non-homogeneous measures.

Notation. We write $A \lesssim B$, if there is a constant $C > 0$ so that $A \leq CB$. We may also write $A \sim B$ if $B \lesssim A \lesssim B$.

We then set some dyadic notation. For cubes Q and R we denote

- $\ell(Q)$ is the side-length of Q;
- $d(Q, R)$ denotes the distance between the cubes Q and R;
- $D(Q, R) := d(Q, R) + \ell(Q) + \ell(R)$ is the long distance;
- $W_Q = Q \times [\ell(Q)/2, \ell(Q))$ is the Whitney region associated with Q;
- $\mathrm{ch}(Q)$ denotes the dyadic children of Q;
- $\mu \lfloor Q$ denotes the measure μ restricted to Q;
- $\langle f \rangle_Q^\mu = \mu(Q)^{-1} \int_Q f \, d\mu$ (or sometimes just $\langle f \rangle_Q$ if the measure is clear from the context).

Acknowledgements. Much of this research was carried out when H.M. was visiting CRM during September 2015, and he would like to thank the institution for its hospitality. We would also like to thank Benjamin Jaye for answering a question of ours regarding a technical point in some Tb theorems.

Announcement of upcoming results. In an upcoming work [15], joint with X. Tolsa, it is shown that the methods in the current paper can be used, in conjunction with new arguments, to prove interesting results for Calderón–Zugmund operators. Currently, our methods work at least for antisymmetric CZ-operators

T_μ. Using testing conditions involving $T_{\mu,*}$, the maximal truncations of T_μ, we can recover the full analogues of the results of the current paper for CZ-operators. Regarding testing conditions involving only T_μ we show that we can drop the buffer assumption from Hytönen–Nazarov [9] also for some exponents *strictly below* 2. In conclusion, in the antisymmetric case we generalise, with a new proof, [9] to the non-homogeneous setting and enhance both of their results concerning testing with $T_{\mu,*}$ and T_μ. This also reproves [10] in the antisymmetric case.

2. The proof of the local Tb theorem

We record the following easy lemma.

2.1. **Lemma.** *Let a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be given and $G \subset Q$. Suppose also that $\nu(Q) \lesssim \ell(Q)^m$. If $\|1_G V_{\nu,Q} f\|_{L^2(\nu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\nu)}$ for every $f \in L^2(\nu)$ satisfying spt $f \subset G$, then also $\|1_G V_\nu f\|_{L^2(\nu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\nu)}$ for every $f \in L^2(\nu)$ satisfying spt $f \subset G$.*

Proof. This follows from the pointwise estimate

$$\int_{\ell(Q)}^\infty |\theta_t^\nu f(x)|^2 \, \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \nu(Q)\ell(Q)^{-2m}\|f\|^2_{L^2(\nu)}.$$

□

2.2. **Definition.** Given a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we consider the following random dyadic grid. For small notational convenience assume that $c_Q = 0$ (that is, Q is centred at the origin). Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ be defined by the requirement $2^{N-3} \leq \ell(Q) < 2^{N-2}$. Consider the random square $Q^* = Q^*(w) = w + [-2^N, 2^N)^n$, where $w \in [-2^{N-1}, 2^{N-1})^n =: \Omega_N = \Omega$. The set Ω is equipped with the normalised Lebesgue measure $\mathbb{P}_N = \mathbb{P}$. We define the grid $\mathcal{D}(w) := \mathcal{D}(Q^*(w))$. Notice that $Q \subset \alpha Q^*(w)$ for some $\alpha < 1$, and $\ell(Q) \sim \ell(Q^*(w))$.

Next, we prove the main Proposition.

2.3. **Proposition.** *Let μ be a measure of order m and $B_1, B_2 < \infty$, $\epsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ be given constants. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a fixed cube. Assume that there exists a complex measure $\nu = \nu_Q$ such that*

(1) spt $\nu \subset Q$;
(2) $\mu(Q) = \nu(Q)$;
(3) $\|\nu\| \leq B_1 \mu(Q)$;
(4) For all Borel sets $A \subset Q$ satisfying $\mu(A) \leq \epsilon_0 \mu(Q)$ we have

$$|\nu|(A) \leq \frac{\|\nu\|}{32 B_1}.$$

Suppose there exist $s > 0$ and a Borel set $U_Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $|\nu|(U_Q) \leq \frac{\|\nu\|}{16 B_1}$ so that

$$\sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^s \mu(\{x \in Q \setminus U_Q : \, V_Q \nu(x) > \lambda\}) \leq B_2 \|\nu\|.$$

Then, there is some subset $G_Q \subset Q \setminus U_Q$ such that $\mu(G_Q) \gtrsim \mu(Q)$ and

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_\mu f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$ satisfying that spt $f \subset G_Q$.

Proof. We can assume that spt $\mu \subset Q$. Indeed, if we have proved the theorem for such measures, we can then apply it to $\mu\lfloor Q$. Let us denote $\sigma = |\nu|$, where $|\nu|$ is the variation measure of ν. Also, let us write the polar decomposition of the complex measure ν as $\nu = b\, d\sigma$, where b is a function so that $|b(x)| = 1$ always.

The idea is to apply the big pieces global Tb theorem from Section 3 (Theorem 3.1). It will be applied to the measure σ and the bounded function b. Using stopping times we need to construct some exceptional sets so that the assumptions of that theorem are verified. Moreover, we need to be able to come back to the μ measure – this requires encompassing additional stopping times to the construction.

We fix w, and write $\mathcal{D}(w) = \mathcal{D}$. We also write $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}(0)$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_w$ consist of the maximal dyadic cubes $R \in \mathcal{D}$ for which

$$\Big| \int_R b\, d\sigma \Big| < \eta \sigma(R),$$

where $\eta := \frac{1}{2} B_1^{-1}$. We set

$$T = T_w = \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{A}} R \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Notice that

$$\sigma(Q) = \|\nu\| \leq B_1 \mu(Q) = B_1 \nu(Q) = B_1 \int_Q b\, d\sigma.$$

Then estimate

$$\int_Q b\, d\sigma = \Big| \int_Q b\, d\sigma \Big| = \Big| \int_{Q \setminus T} b\, d\sigma + \sum_{R \in \mathcal{A}} \int_R b\, d\sigma \Big| \leq \sigma(Q \setminus T) + \eta \sigma(Q).$$

Since $\eta B_1 = 1/2$ we conclude that

$$\sigma(Q) \leq B_1 \sigma(Q \setminus T) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma(Q),$$

and so

$$\sigma(Q) \leq 2B_1 [\sigma(Q) - \sigma(T)].$$

From here we can read that

$$\sigma(T) \leq (1 - \eta) \sigma(Q).$$

Next, let $\mathcal{F}$ consist of the maximal dyadic cubes $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$ for which

$$\sigma(R) > \frac{B_1}{\epsilon_0} \mu(R)$$

or

$$\sigma(R) < \delta \mu(R),$$

where $\delta := \eta/16 = \frac{1}{32}B_1^{-1}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be the collection of maximal cubes $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$ satisfying the first condition, and define $\mathcal{F}_2$ analogously. Note that

$$\mu\Big(\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{F}_1} R\Big) \leq \epsilon_0\mu(Q),$$

so that we have by assumption (4) that

$$\sigma\Big(\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{F}_1} R\Big) \leq \frac{1}{32B_1}\sigma(Q) = \delta\sigma(Q).$$

Finally, we record that

$$\sigma\Big(\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{F}_2} R\Big) = \sum_{R\in\mathcal{F}_2}\sigma(R) \leq \delta\sum_{R\in\mathcal{F}_2}\mu(R) = \delta\mu\Big(\bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{F}_2} R\Big) \leq \delta\mu(Q) \leq \delta\sigma(Q).$$

We may conclude that the set

$$H_1 = \bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{F}} R$$

satisfies $\sigma(H_1) \leq 2\delta\sigma(Q) = \frac{\eta}{8}\sigma(Q)$.

We now record the important property of the exceptional set H_1. Let $x \in Q\setminus H_1$. For any $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$ satisfying that $x \in R$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{32B_1} = \delta \leq \frac{\sigma(R)}{\mu(R)} \leq \frac{B_1}{\epsilon_0}.$$

From this we can conclude (using a dyadic variant of Lemma 2.13 of [16]) that for all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there holds that

$$\delta\mu(A\cap(Q\setminus H_1)) \leq \sigma(A\cap(Q\setminus H_1)) \leq \frac{B_1}{\epsilon_0}\mu(A\cap(Q\setminus H_1)).$$

In particular, we have that $\sigma\lfloor(Q\setminus H_1) \ll \mu\lfloor(Q\setminus H_1)$. Using Radon–Nikodym theorem we let $\varphi \geq 0$ be a function so that

$$\sigma(A) = \int_A \varphi\, d\mu$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset Q\setminus H_1$. We obviously have that $\varphi \sim 1$ for μ-a.e. $x \in Q\setminus H_1$.

We need another exceptional set H_2. To this end, let

$$p(x) = \sup_{r>0}\frac{\sigma(B(x,r))}{r^m} = M_{R,m}\nu(x).$$

For $p_0 > 0$ let $E_{p_0} = \{p \geq p_0\}$. Using that $M_{R,m}\colon M(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^{1,\infty}(\mu)$ boundedly we see that

$$\mu(E_{p_0}) = \mu(\{M_{R,m}\nu \geq p_0\}) \leq \frac{C}{p_0}\|\nu\| \leq \frac{CB_1}{p_0}\mu(Q).$$

We fix $p_0 \lesssim 1$ so large that $\mu(E_{p_0/2^m}) \leq \epsilon_0\mu(Q)$, so that in particular $\sigma(E_{p_0/2^m}) \leq \frac{\eta}{8}\sigma(Q)$. For $x \in \{p > p_0\}$ define

$$r(x) = \sup\{r > 0\colon \sigma(B(x,r)) > p_0 r^m\},$$

and then set

$$H_2 := \bigcup_{x\in\{p>p_0\}} B(x, r(x)).$$

It is clear that every ball B_r with $\sigma(B_r) > p_0 r^m$ satisfies $B_r \subset H_2$. Notice that if $y \in H_2$, then there is $x \in \{p > p_0\}$ so that $y \in B(x, r(x))$, and so $\sigma(B(y, 2r(x)) \geq \sigma(B(x, r(x)) \geq p_0 r(x)^m = p_0 2^{-m}[2r(x)]^m$. We conclude that $H_2 \subset E_{p_0/2^m}$, and so $\sigma(H_2) \leq \frac{\eta}{8}\sigma(Q)$.

The assumption about the set U_Q reads $\sigma(U_Q) \leq \frac{\eta}{8}\sigma(Q)$. Define now $H = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup U_Q$. The properties of H are as follows:

(1) We have $\sigma(H) \leq \frac{\eta}{2}\sigma(Q)$, and so $\sigma(H \cup T_w) \leq (1 - \eta/2)\sigma(Q) = \tau_1\sigma(Q)$, $\tau_1 < 1$.
(2) If $\sigma(B_r) > p_0 r^m$, then $B_r \subset H$.
(3) We have a function φ so that

$$\sigma(A) = \int_A \varphi \, d\mu$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset Q \setminus H$, and $\varphi \sim 1$ for μ-a.e. $x \in Q \setminus H$.

We also have for every $\lambda > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda^s \sigma(\{x \in Q \setminus H\colon\ V_{\sigma,Q} b(x) > \lambda\}) \\
&\quad = \lambda^s \sigma(\{x \in Q \setminus H\colon\ V_Q \nu(x) > \lambda\}) \\
&\quad \lesssim \lambda^s \mu(\{x \in Q \setminus U_Q\colon\ V_Q \nu(x) > \lambda\}) \leq B_2 \|\nu\| = B_2 \sigma(Q).
\end{aligned}$$

Appealing to Theorem 3.1 with the measure σ and the L^∞ function b we find $G_Q \subset Q \setminus H \subset Q \setminus U_Q$ so that $\sigma(G_Q) \gtrsim \sigma(Q)$ and

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q} f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \tag{2.4}$$

for every $f \in L^2(\sigma)$.

Suppose now that $g \in L^2(\mu)$ and $\operatorname{spt} g \subset G_Q$. We apply Equation (2.4) with $f = g/\varphi$ (since $G_Q \subset Q \setminus H$ we have $\varphi \sim 1$ μ-a.e. on the support of g). Notice that

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q}(g/\varphi)\|_{L^2(\sigma)} = \|1_{G_Q} V_{\mu,Q} g\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \gtrsim \|1_{G_Q} V_{\mu,Q} g\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

so that

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_{\mu,Q} g\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|g/\varphi\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 we conclude that

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_\mu f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$ satisfying that $\operatorname{spt} f \subset G_Q$. Moreover, we have that

$$\mu(Q) \leq \sigma(Q) \lesssim \sigma(G_Q) = \int_{G_Q} \varphi \, d\mu \lesssim \mu(G_Q).$$

We are done. □

Let us now record the non-homogenous good lambda method of Tolsa. This is essentially Theorem 2.22 in [19] (it is written for Calderón–Zygmund operators but the proof extends easily to square functions). However, we also add the requirement that our cubes should have small boundary, which requires some modifications in the argument. The details are rather straightforward but are given in [15].

2.5. **Theorem.** *Let μ be a measure of order m in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\beta > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ be big enough numbers, depending only on the dimension n, and assume $\theta \in (0,1)$. Suppose for each $(2,\beta)$-doubling cube Q with C_1-small boundary there exists a subset $G_Q \subset Q$ such that $\mu(G_Q) \geq \theta\mu(Q)$ and $V\colon M(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^{1,\infty}(\mu\lfloor G_Q)$ is bounded with a uniform constant independent of Q. Then V_μ is bounded in $L^p(\mu)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$ with a constant depending on p and on the preceding constants.*

2.6. *Remark.* In Theorem 2.5 the assumption $V\colon M(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^{1,\infty}(\mu\lfloor G_Q)$ can be replaced by $V_\mu\colon L^2(\mu\lfloor G_Q) \to L^2(\mu\lfloor G_Q)$. Indeed, the latter assumption implies the former one by standard results (see Theorem 2.16 in [19]).

We are ready to prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Proposition 2.3 gives for every $(2,\beta)$-doubling cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with C_1-small boundary a subset $G_Q \subset Q$ such that $\mu(G_Q) \gtrsim \mu(Q)$ and

$$\|1_{G_Q} V_\mu f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for every $f \in L^2(\mu)$ with $\operatorname{spt} f \subset G_Q$. Applying Theorem 2.5 and Remark 2.6 gives the result. □

3. Big pieces global Tb

In this section we prove the "big pieces" global Tb theorem for square functions which we needed above. For antisymmetric Calderón–Zygmund operators with some assumptions about the maximal truncation $T_\# b$ this is by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg (see also Theorem 5.1 in Tolsa's book [19]).

3.1. **Theorem.** *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a cube. Let σ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ so that $\operatorname{spt}\sigma \subset Q$. Suppose b is a function satisfying that $\|b\|_{L^\infty(\sigma)} \leq C_b$. For every w let T_w be the union of the maximal dyadic cubes $R \in \mathcal{D}(w)$ for which*

$$\Big|\int_R b\,d\sigma\Big| < c_{\text{acc}}\sigma(R).$$

We are also given a measurable set $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the following properties.

- *There is $\delta_0 < 1$ so that $\sigma(H \cup T_w) \leq \delta_0\sigma(Q)$ for every w.*
- *Every ball B_r of radius r satisfying $\sigma(B_r) > C_0 r^m$ satisfies $B_r \subset H$.*
- *We have for some $s > 0$ the estimate*

$$\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda^s \sigma(\{x \in Q \setminus H\colon\ V_{\sigma,Q} b(x) > \lambda\}) \leq C_1\sigma(Q).$$

Then there is a measurable set G_Q satisfying $G_Q \subset Q \setminus H$ and the following properties:

(a) $\sigma(G_Q) \gtrsim \sigma(Q)$.
(b) $\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q} f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}$ *for every* $f \in L^2(\sigma)$.

3.2. *Remark.* Only the good lambda method (Theorem 2.5) and hence the main theorem (Theorem 1.4) require the x-continuity of s_t i.e. (1.3). Proposition 2.3 and the above Theorem 3.1 do not require it.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We begin by suppressing our operator appropriately. Set

$$S_0 = \{x \in Q\colon\ V_{\sigma,Q} b(x) > \lambda_0\},$$

where $0 < \lambda_0 \lesssim 1$ is large enough. Now simply define

$$\tilde{s}_t(x,y) = s_t(x,y) 1_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0}(x).$$

Notice that $(\tilde{s}_t)_{t>0}$ is a measurable family of kernels satisfying (1.1) and (1.2), which is all we shall need in what follows. Now, $\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q}$ (and similar objects) are defined in the natural way using the kernels $\tilde{s}_t$. Then for any f we have

$$\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q} f(x) = V_{\sigma,Q} f(x) 1_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0}(x) = V_{\sigma,Q} f(x) 1_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (Q \cap \{V_{\sigma,Q} b > \lambda_0\})}(x), \tag{3.3}$$

and from here we can easily read two key things about these suppressed operators. The first is that for any f we have

$$\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q} f(x) = V_{\sigma,Q} f(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0, \tag{3.4}$$

and the second is that

$$\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q} b(x) \leq \lambda_0 \text{ for every } x \in Q. \tag{3.5}$$

Finally, with a large enough choice of λ_0 we have (for every w) that $\sigma(H \cup T_w \cup S_0) \leq \delta_1 \sigma(Q)$ for some $\delta_1 < 1$. Indeed,

$$\sigma(S_0 \setminus H) \leq \sigma(\{x \in Q \setminus H\colon\ V_{\sigma,Q} b(x) > \lambda_0\}) \leq \frac{C_1}{\lambda_0^s} \sigma(Q).$$

At this point $\lambda_0 \lesssim 1$ can be fixed by demanding that it satisfies

$$\lambda_0^s > \frac{2C_1}{1-\delta_0},$$

whence we conclude that

$$\sigma(H \cup T_w \cup S_0) \leq \sigma(H \cup T_w) + \sigma(S_0 \setminus H) \leq \frac{1+\delta_0}{2} \sigma(Q) =: \delta_1 \sigma(Q),\ \delta_1 < 1. \tag{3.6}$$

We are now done with suppressing the operator.

We will next define the set G_Q. This is done by setting

$$p_0(x) = \mathbb{P}(\{w \in \Omega\colon\ x \in Q \setminus [H \cup T_w \cup S_0]\}),$$

and then defining

$$G_Q = \left\{x \in Q\colon\ p_0(x) > \frac{1-\delta_1}{2} =: \tau\right\} \subset Q \setminus H.$$

An argument by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg shows that $\sigma(G_Q) \gtrsim \sigma(Q)$. Indeed, the argument goes as follows. Notice first that by (3.6) we have that

$$\int_Q p_0(x)\,d\sigma(x) = \int_\Omega \sigma(Q \setminus [H \cup T_w \cup S_0])\,d\mathbb{P}(w) \geq (1-\delta_1)\sigma(Q).$$

Since $1 - p_0 \geq 0$ everywhere, and $1 - p_0 \geq 1 - \tau = (1+\delta_1)/2$ on $Q \setminus G_Q$, we have

$$\int_Q (1-p_0(x))\,d\sigma(x) \geq \int_{Q\setminus G_Q} (1-p_0(x))\,d\sigma(x) \geq \frac{1+\delta_1}{2}\sigma(Q \setminus G_Q).$$

We conclude that

$$\sigma(Q \setminus G_Q) \leq \frac{2}{1+\delta_1}\Big(\sigma(Q) - \int_Q p_0(x)\,d\sigma(x)\Big) \leq \frac{2\delta_1}{1+\delta_1}\sigma(Q),$$

and so

$$\sigma(G_Q) \geq \Big(1 - \frac{2\delta_1}{1+\delta_1}\Big)\sigma(Q) = \frac{1-\delta_1}{1+\delta_1}\sigma(Q).$$

It remains to prove that $\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q} f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}$ for every $f \in L^2(\sigma)$. The key property of G_Q is as follows. Suppose $h \geq 0$ is any positive function. Then we have that

$$\int_{G_Q} h(x)\,d\sigma(x) \leq \tau^{-1}\int_{G_Q} p_0(x)h(x)\,d\sigma(x) = \tau^{-1}E_w \int_{G_Q\setminus[H\cup T_w\cup S]} h(x)\,d\sigma(x).$$

We apply this as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q} f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} &= \int_{G_Q}\int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2\,\frac{dt}{t}\,d\sigma(x)\\
&\leq \tau^{-1}E_w \int_{G_Q\setminus[H\cup T_w\cup S_0]}\int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2\,\frac{dt}{t}\,d\sigma(x)\\
&= \tau^{-1}E_w \sum_{R\in\mathcal{D}_0}\int_{[R\cap G_Q]\setminus[H\cup T_w\cup S_0]}\int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2\,\frac{dt}{t}\,d\sigma(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where again $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}(0)$. Given w we then write

$$\sum_{R\in\mathcal{D}_0} = \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-good}}} + \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-bad}}},$$

where $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$ is said to be $\mathcal{D}(w)$-good if $d(R,\partial P) > \ell(R)^\gamma \ell(P)^{1-\gamma}$ for every $P \in \mathcal{D}(w)$ satisfying $\ell(P) \geq 2^r\ell(R)$. Here $r \lesssim 1$ is a fixed large enough parameter, and $\gamma := \alpha/(2m+2\alpha)$. It is a standard fact by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg that given $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\{w \in \Omega\colon\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-bad}\}) \leq \tau/2 \tag{3.7}$$

for a large enough fixed r.

Using (3.7) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} E_w & \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-bad}}} \int_{[R\cap G_Q]\setminus[H\cup T_w\cup S_0]} \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \\ &\le \sum_{R\in\mathcal{D}_0} \mathbb{P}(\{w\in\Omega\colon\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-bad}\}) \int_{R\cap G_Q} \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \\ &\le \frac{\tau}{2} \int_{G_Q} \int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\theta_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x). \end{aligned}$$

To be precise, for the following we would need the a priori finiteness of this term. However, this is easy to arrange in a multiple of ways, so we skip this technicality. We may now conclude (using also that $\theta_t^\sigma f(x) = \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma f(x)$ for every $x \in Q \setminus S_0$ by (3.4)) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|1_{G_Q} V_{\sigma,Q} f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2 \\ &\quad\le 2\tau^{-1} E_w \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-good}}} \int_{[R\cap G_Q]\setminus[H\cup T_w\cup S_0]} \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \\ &\quad\lesssim E_w \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}(w)\text{-good}\\ R\not\subset H\cup T_w}} \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x). \end{aligned}$$

We will now fix w, write $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(w)$ and $T = T_w$, and prove that

$$\sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}\text{-good}\\ R\not\subset H\cup T}} \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma f(x)|^2 \,\frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2. \tag{3.8}$$

This will then end the proof.

The important property of the set T is that if $R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R \not\subset T$ then

$$\Big| \int_R b\, d\sigma \Big| \gtrsim \sigma(R),$$

while the important property of the set H is that if $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an arbitrary cube satisfying $L \not\subset H$ then $\sigma(\lambda L) \lesssim \lambda^m \ell(L)^m$ for all $\lambda \ge 1$. It is useful to say that $R \in \mathcal{D}_0^{tr}$ (tr stands for *transit*) if $R \in \mathcal{D}_0$, $\sigma(R) \neq 0$ and $R \not\subset H \cup T$, and $P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$ if $P \in \mathcal{D}$, $\sigma(P) \neq 0$ and $P \not\subset H \cup T$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}$ really means w-transit cubes from $\mathcal{D}_0$ (and one should really write $\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}(w)$), but w is fixed and so T is fixed and we do not need to insist on this.

It is time to expand the function f in the grid $\mathcal{D}$ using b-adapted martingales only in the transit cubes $P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$. Denote $\langle f\rangle_A = \langle f\rangle_A^\sigma = \sigma(A)^{-1}\int_A f\, d\sigma$, if $\sigma(A) \neq$

0. Let $P_0 = Q^*(w)$ (see the Definition 2.2) so that all $P \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfy $P \subset P_0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\operatorname{spt} b \subset Q$ and $\operatorname{spt} f \subset Q$. Define

$$E_{P_0} f = \frac{\langle f \rangle_{P_0}}{\langle b \rangle_{P_0}} b.$$

(This is actually independent of w since it just equals $E_Q f$, because $\operatorname{spt} \sigma \subset Q \subset P_0$). For any cube $P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$ define the function $\Delta_P f$ as follows:

$$\Delta_P f = \sum_{\substack{P' \in \operatorname{ch}(P) \\ \sigma(P') \neq 0}} A_{P'}(f) 1_{P'},$$

where

$$A_{P'}(f) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\langle f \rangle_{P'}}{\langle b \rangle_{P'}} - \frac{\langle f \rangle_P}{\langle b \rangle_P} \right) b & \text{if } P' \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}, \\ f - \frac{\langle f \rangle_P}{\langle b \rangle_P} b & \text{if } P' \notin \mathcal{D}^{tr}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $P_0 \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$, since $\sigma(P_0) = \sigma(Q)$ and every non-transit cube P has to satisfy $\sigma(P) \leq \sigma(H \cup T) \leq \delta_0 \sigma(Q)$. It is easy to see that

$$f = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}} \Delta_P f + E_{P_0} f$$

σ-a.e. and in $L^2(\sigma)$, and that

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}} \|\Delta_P f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} + \|E_{P_0} f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}.$$

See e.g. Section 5.4.4 of [19]. It will be convenient to exploit notation by redefining on the largest level P_0 the operator $\Delta_{P_0} f$ to be $\Delta_{P_0} f + E_{P_0} f$.

Going back to (3.8) we see that we need to control

$$\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{D}_0^{tr} \\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}\text{-good}}} \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R), \ell(Q))} \Big| \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}} \widetilde{\theta}_t^{\sigma} \Delta_P f(x) \Big|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \, d\sigma(x).$$

Given $R \in \mathcal{D}_0^{tr}$, R is $\mathcal{D}(w)$-good, the $P \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$ summation is split in to the following four pieces:

(1) P: $\ell(P) < \ell(R)$;
(2) P: $\ell(P) \geq \ell(R)$ and $d(P, R) > \ell(R)^{\gamma} \ell(P)^{1-\gamma}$;
(3) P: $\ell(R) \leq \ell(P) \leq 2^r \ell(R)$ and $d(P, R) \leq \ell(R)^{\gamma} \ell(P)^{1-\gamma}$;
(4) P: $\ell(P) > 2^r \ell(R)$ and $d(P, R) \leq \ell(R)^{\gamma} \ell(P)^{1-\gamma}$.

For future need we set

$$A_{PR} := \frac{\ell(P)^{\alpha/2} \ell(R)^{\alpha/2}}{D(P, R)^{m+\alpha}} \sigma(P)^{1/2} \sigma(R)^{1/2};$$
$$D(P, R) := \ell(P) + \ell(R) + d(P, R).$$

The following estimate by Nazarov–Treil–Volberg is extremely useful

$$\sum_{\substack{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}\\ R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}}} A_{PR}x_P y_R \lesssim \Big(\sum_P x_P^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_R y_R^2\Big)^{1/2}$$

for every $x_P, y_R \geq 0$. For an easy reference, see pp. 159–160 in [19]. In particular, we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}}\Big[\sum_{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}} A_{PR}x_P\Big]^2\Big)^{1/2} \lesssim \Big(\sum_P x_P^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

The sums (1) and (2) are handled as follows. Notice that in (1) we have $\ell(P) < \ell(R) \leq \ell(P_0)$ so that $\int \Delta_P f\, d\sigma = 0$. Therefore, using the y-Hölder for $\tilde{s}_t$ we get

$$|\widetilde{\theta}_t^{\sigma}\Delta_P f(x)| \lesssim A_{PR}\sigma(R)^{-1/2}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad (x,t)\in W_R, \tag{3.9}$$

where $W_R := R\times[\ell(R)/2, \ell(R))$. In the case (2), the size estimate for $\tilde{s}_t$ yields

$$|\widetilde{\theta}_t^{\sigma}\Delta_P f(x)| \lesssim \frac{\ell(R)^{\alpha}}{d(P,R)^{m+\alpha}}\sigma(P)^{1/2}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad (x,t)\in W_R.$$

But this yields the same bound as in (3.9), since here

$$\frac{\ell(R)^{\alpha}}{d(P,R)^{m+\alpha}}\sigma(P)^{1/2} \lesssim A_{PR}\sigma(R)^{-1/2}.$$

To see this, notice that it is obvious if $d(P,R)\geq \ell(P)$. In the opposite case note that $d(P,R)^{m+\alpha} \gtrsim D(P,R)^{m+\alpha}\ell(P)^{-\alpha/2}\ell(R)^{\alpha/2}$. This is seen by combining the facts that $d(P,R) > \ell(R)^{\gamma}\ell(P)^{1-\gamma}$, $\gamma m + \gamma\alpha = \alpha/2$ and $D(P,R)\lesssim \ell(P)$. Thus, also in the case (2) the estimate (3.9) holds. The cases (1) and (2) are therefore under control via the estimate

$$\sum_{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}}\Big[\sum_{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}} A_{PR}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\Big]^2 \lesssim \sum_{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2.$$

The summation (3) is even easier. Using that P and R are both transit, $t\sim\ell(R)\sim\ell(P)$ and the size estimate for $\tilde{s}_t$ we see that

$$|\widetilde{\theta}_t^{\sigma}\Delta_P f(x)| \lesssim t^{-m}\sigma(P)^{1/2}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \sigma(R)^{-1/2}\|\Delta_P f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}, \qquad (x,t)\in W_R.$$

This can then easily be summed, since given R there are only finitely many P such that $\ell(P)\sim\ell(R)$ and $d(P,R)\lesssim \min(\ell(P),\ell(R))$.

We move on to the main term (4). For each $R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}$ satisfying that R is $\mathcal{D}$-good, $R\subset P_0$ and $\ell(R) < 2^{-r}\ell(P_0)$ we let $P_{R,k}\in\mathcal{D}$, $k\in\{r, r+1,\dots,\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]\}$, be the unique $\mathcal{D}$-cube satisfying that $\ell(P_{R,k}) = 2^k\ell(R)$ and $R\subset P_{R,k}$. Such a cube exists since R is $\mathcal{D}$-good. Moreover, since $R\not\subset H\cup T$ then also $P_{R,k}\not\subset H\cup T$ i.e.

$P_{R,k} \in \mathcal{D}^{tr}$. We see that we only need to prove that

$$\sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}\colon R\subset P_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}\text{-good}\\ \ell(R)<2^{-r}\ell(P_0)}} \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} \Big| \sum_{k=r+1}^{\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]} \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma \Delta_{P_{R,k}} f(x)\Big|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2.$$

Recalling that all $P_{R,k}$, $r \le k \le \log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]$ are transit, we see using a standard calculation that $\sum_{k=r+1}^{\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]} \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma \Delta_{P_{R,k}} f$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} &- \sum_{k=r+1}^{\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]} B_{P_{R,k-1}} \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma (1_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus P_{R,k-1}} b) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{k=r+1}^{\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]} \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma (1_{P_{R,k}\setminus P_{R,k-1}} \Delta_{P_{R,k}} f) + \frac{\langle f\rangle_{P_{R,r}}}{\langle b\rangle_{P_{R,r}}} \widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma b, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_{P_{R,k-1}} = \langle \Delta_{P_{R,k}} f/b\rangle_{P_{R,k-1}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle f\rangle_{P_{R,k-1}}}{\langle b\rangle_{P_{R,k-1}}} - \frac{\langle f\rangle_{P_{R,k}}}{\langle b\rangle_{P_{R,k}}}, & \text{if } r+1 \le k < \log_2 \frac{\ell(P_0)}{\ell(R)}, \\ \frac{\langle f\rangle_{P_{R,k-1}}}{\langle b\rangle_{P_{R,k-1}}}, & k = \log_2 \frac{\ell(P_0)}{\ell(R)}. \end{cases}$$

Let us start deciphering this by proving that the term

$$\Pi := \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}\colon R\subset P_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}\text{-good}\\ \ell(R)<2^{-r}\ell(P_0)}} \Big|\frac{\langle f\rangle_{P_{R,r}}}{\langle b\rangle_{P_{R,r}}}\Big|^2 \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma b(x)|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x)$$

is under control. We simply estimate

$$\Pi \lesssim \sum_{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}} |\langle f\rangle_P|^2 a_P, \qquad a_P := \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}\colon R\subset P_0\\ R \text{ is } \mathcal{D}\text{-good}\\ \ell(R)<2^{-r}\ell(P_0)\\ P_{R,r}=P}} \int_R \int_{\ell(R)/2}^{\min(\ell(R),\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma b(x)|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x).$$

To have $\Pi \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}^2$ it is enough to verify the Carleson property of $(a_P)_{P\in\mathcal{D}}$. To this end, let $S \in \mathcal{D}$ be arbitrary. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{P\in\mathcal{D}\\ P\subset S}} a_P &\le \sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}\\ R\subset S}} \iint_{[S\times(0,\ell(Q))]\cap W_R} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma b(x)|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) \\ &\le \iint_{S\times(0,\ell(Q))} |\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma b(x)|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\, d\sigma(x) = \int_S [\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q} b(x)]^2\, d\sigma(x) \lesssim \sigma(S), \end{aligned}$$

since $\widetilde{V}_{\sigma,Q} b(x) \lesssim 1$ for every $x \in \operatorname{spt}\sigma$ by (3.5).

We are only left with some completely standard calculations (but we need to be slightly careful to use transitivity). So let us first control $|B_{P_{R,k-1}}\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus P_{R,k-1}}b)(x)|$ for $(x,t)\in W_R$. Notice that $R\subset B(x,d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})/2)$, since $d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})\geq 2^{r(1-\gamma)}\ell(R)\geq C_d\ell(R)$ by having r large enough to begin with. The point of this observation is that $B(x,d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})/2)\not\subset H$. Moreover, we clearly have that $B(x,d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})/2)\subset P_{R,k-1}$. Using these facts we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus P_{R,k-1}}b)(x)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B(x,d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})/2)}\frac{\ell(R)^\alpha}{d(x,y)^{m+\alpha}}\,d\sigma(y)\\ &\lesssim \ell(R)^\alpha d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})^{-\alpha}\lesssim \Big(\frac{\ell(R)}{\ell(P_{R,k-1})}\Big)^{\alpha/2}\sim 2^{-\alpha k/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we also used that $d(R,\partial P_{R,k-1})\geq \ell(R)^{1/2}\ell(P_{R,k-1})^{1/2}$ (which follows since R is $\mathcal{D}$-good). Since $P_{R,k-1}\not\subset T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|B_{P_{R,k-1}}|\sigma(P_{R,k-1}) &\lesssim \Big|\int_{P_{R,k-1}} B_{P_{R,k-1}}b\,d\sigma\Big|\\ &= \Big|\int_{P_{R,k-1}}\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\,d\sigma\Big|\leq \sigma(P_{R,k-1})^{1/2}\|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates we get for $(x,t)\in W_R$ that

$$|B_{P_{R,k-1}}\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus P_{R,k-1}}b)(x)|\lesssim 2^{-\alpha k/2}\sigma(P_{R,k-1})^{-1/2}\|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Let us still estimate $|\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_{P_{R,k}\setminus P_{R,k-1}}\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f)(x)|$ for $(x,t)\in W_R$. Let $S\in \mathrm{ch}(P_{R,k})$, $S\neq P_{R,k-1}$. We do not know whether this cube is transitive or not, but it shall not matter. Indeed, we just estimate

$$\begin{aligned}|\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_S\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f)(x)| &\lesssim \frac{\ell(R)^\alpha}{d(R,S)^{m+\alpha}}\int_{P_{R,k}}|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f(y)|\,d\sigma(y)\\ &\lesssim \Big(\frac{\ell(R)}{\ell(P_{R,k-1})}\Big)^{\alpha/2}\frac{\sigma(P_{R,k})^{1/2}}{\ell(P_{R,k-1})^m}\|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\\ &\lesssim 2^{-\alpha k/2}\sigma(P_{R,k-1})^{-1/2}\|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\|_{L^2(\sigma)},\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\ell(S)=\ell(P_{R,k-1})$, $d(R,S)^{m+\alpha}\geq \ell(R)^{\alpha/2}\ell(S)^{\alpha/2}\ell(S)^m$ and the transitivity of $P_{R,k-1},P_{R,k}$. So $|\widetilde{\theta}_t^\sigma(1_{P_{R,k}\setminus P_{R,k-1}}\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f)(x)|$ satisfies the same estimate as in (3.10).

We are done with the proof if we can control the summation

$$\sum_{\substack{R\in\mathcal{D}_0^{tr}:\,R\subset P_0\\ R\text{ is }\mathcal{D}\text{-good}\\ \ell(R)<2^{-r}\ell(P_0)}}\sigma(R)\Big[\sum_{k=r+1}^{\log_2[\ell(P_0)/\ell(R)]}2^{-\alpha k/2}\sigma(P_{R,k-1})^{-1/2}\|\Delta_{P_{R,k}}f\|_{L^2(\sigma)}\Big]^2.$$

But this can be dominated by

$$\sum_{P\in\mathcal{D}^{tr}} \|\Delta_P f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)} \lesssim \|f\|^2_{L^2(\sigma)}$$

using a similar summation argument that appears in p. 9 in [12]. □

REFERENCES

[1] P. Auscher, S. Hofmann, C. Muscalu, T. Tao, C. Thiele, Carleson measures, trees, extrapolation, and $T(b)$ theorems, Publ. Mat. 46 (2) (2002) 257–325.

[2] P. Auscher, S. Hofmann, M. Lacey, A. McIntosh, P. Tchamitchian, The solution of the Kato square root problem for second order elliptic operators on $\mathbb{R}^n$, Ann. of Math. 156 (2) (2002) 633–654.

[3] P. Auscher, E. Routin, Local Tb theorems and Hardy inequalities, J. Geom. Anal. 23 (1) (2013) 303–374.

[4] P. Auscher, Q. X. Yang, BCR algorithm and the $T(b)$ theorem, Publ. Mat. 53 (1) (2009) 179–196.

[5] M. Christ, A $T(b)$ theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral, Colloq. Math. 50/51 (1990) 601–628.

[6] S. Hofmann, Local Tb theorems and applications in PDE, International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 1375–1392.

[7] S. Hofmann, A local Tb theorem for square functions, Perspectives in partial differential equations, harmonic analysis and applications (Providence, RI, 2008), pp. 175–185, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 79, Amer. Math. Soc. (2008)

[8] S. Hofmann, A proof of the local Tb theorem for standard Calderón–Zygmund operators, unpublished manuscript, arXiv:0705.0840, 2007.

[9] T. Hytönen, F. Nazarov, The local Tb theorem with rough test functions, preprint, arXiv:1206.0907, 2012.

[10] M. Lacey, H. Martikainen, Local Tb theorem with L^2 testing conditions and general measures: Calderón–Zygmund operators, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér., to appear, arXiv:1310.8531, 2013.

[11] M. Lacey, H. Martikainen, Local Tb theorem with L^2 testing conditions and general measures: Square functions, J. Anal. Math., to appear, arXiv:1308.4571, 2013.

[12] H. Martikainen, M. Mourgoglou, Square functions with general measures, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (2014) 3923–3931.

[13] H. Martikainen, M. Mourgoglou, Boundedness of non-homogeneous square functions and L^q type testing conditions with $q \in (1, 2)$, Math. Res. Lett., to appear, arXiv:1401.5457, 2014.

[14] H. Martikainen, M. Mourgoglou, T. Orponen, Square functions with general measures II, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 63 (5) (2014) 1249–1279.

[15] H. Martikainen, M. Mourgoglou, X. Tolsa, A new approach to non-homogeneous local Tb theorems II: CZ-operators and testing conditions with general exponents, manuscript.

[16] P. Mattila, Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces: Fractals and rectifiability, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[17] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, A. Volberg, Accretive system Tb-theorems on nonhomogeneous spaces, Duke Math. J. 113 (2) (2002) 259–312.

[18] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, A. Volberg, The Tb-theorem on non-homogeneous spaces that proves a conjecture of Vitushkin, unpublished manuscript, arXiv:1401.2479.

[19] X. Tolsa, Analytic capacity, the Cauchy transform, and non-homogeneous Calderón–Zygmund theory, Progress in Mathematics, Vol. 307, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2014.

(H.M.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, P.O.B. 68, FI-00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND
E-mail address: henri.martikainen@helsinki.fi

(M.M.) DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA AND CENTRE DE RESERCA MATEMÀTICA, EDIFICI C FACULTAT DE CIÈNCIES, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA)
E-mail address: mmourgoglou@crm.cat

(E.V.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, P.O.B. 68, FI-00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND
E-mail address: emil.vuorinen@helsinki.fi